

1 John F. Lomax, Jr. (#020224)
 2 Brian J. Foster (#012143)
 3 Joseph A. Kroeger (#026036)
 4 SNELL & WILMER
 5 One Arizona Center
 6 400 E. Van Buren
 7 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
 Telephone: (602) 382-6000
 Facsimile: (602) 382-6070
 Email: jlomax@swlaw.com
 bfoster@swlaw.com
 jkroeger@swlaw.com
 Attorneys for Defendant

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

10 KELVIN D. DANIEL, et al.,

11 Case No. 2:11-cv-01548-PHX-ROS

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.
 14 SWIFT TRANSPORTATION
 15 CORPORATION,

16 DEFENDANT SWIFT
 17 CORPORATION, LLC'S STATEMENT
 18 OF MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT
 19 OF ITS MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 20 JUDGMENT

21 Defendant.

22 Assigned to: Hon. Roslyn O. Silver

23 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 and LR Civ. 56.1(a), Swift Transportation Co. of
 24 Arizona, LLC ("Swift"), files its separate Statement of Material Facts in Support of its
 25 Motion for Summary Judgment, as follows:

26 **MATERIAL FACTS**

27 1. Kelvin Daniel submitted an online application for a commercial truck driver
 28 position with Swift, a position regulated by the U.S. Department of Transportation, on
 December 27, 2010. *See* Declaration of Michelle Cordova, attached hereto as Exhibit
 ("Exh.") A, at ¶ 2; Deposition Transcript of Kelvin Daniel, cited portions attached hereto
 as Exh. B, at 118:10 – 119:19; Doc. 19 at ¶ 9. *See also* Swift's First Amended and
 Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, served on July 19,

1 2012, a true and correct copy of which are attached hereto as Exh. E, Responses to
 2 Interrogatory Nos. 3, 5, 10.

3 2. Swift ordered a consumer report on Daniel, including a criminal background
 4 report, on December 28, 2010, the day after he applied. *See* Exh. A at ¶ 3; Exh. B at
 5 132:7 – 134:11. The report contained no criminal background information, *e.g.*, it was
 6 “clean.” Exh. A at ¶ 3; Exh. B at 134:24 – 135:14; Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory No.
 7 10.

8 3. Swift had no in-person contact with Daniel until January 24, 2011, when
 9 Daniel attended an orientation. Exh. B at 133:24-134:11; 135:24 – 136:5; 138:15 –
 10 139:14; 142:19 – 143:6; Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory No. 9.

11 4. Tanna Hodges applied in-person with Swift on September 25, 2009 by
 12 leaving a copy of her application with a company location in San Antonio. Deposition
 13 Transcript of Tanna Hodges, cited portions attached hereto as Exh. C, at 130:13 – 132:9
 14 (including Depo. Exh. 24); Exh. E., Response to Interrogatory No. 10.

15 5. Hodges applied again in-person with Swift on September 29, 2009, by
 16 leaving a copy of her application at Swift’s Columbus, Ohio terminal. Exh. C at 159:19 –
 17 160:25 (including Depo. Exh. 1); Exh. E., Response to Interrogatory No. 10.

18 6. Swift did not order a consumer report with respect to Hodges’ September
 19 25, 2009 or September 29, 2009 applications. Exh. A at ¶ 4; Exh. C at 151:18 – 152:3;
 20 173:6-9; 178:5-11; Exh. E., Response to Interrogatory No. 10.

21 7. Hodges’ December 12, 2009 employment application was a computer
 22 website application, submitted on-line, and there was no in-person interaction with Swift
 23 prior to submitting this application. Exh. C at 182:7 – 184:16 (including Depo. Exh. 23);
 24 Exh. E., Response to Interrogatory Nos. 9 and 10.

25 8. Swift ordered Hodges’ consumer report on December 14, 2009. Exh. A at ¶
 26 5. The report shows that it was ordered on December 14, 2009. *Id.* Swift produced this
 27 consumer report to Plaintiffs on January 9, 2012. *See* Swift’s Initial Disclosure Statement,
 28 a true and correct copy attached hereto as Exh. D; Doc. 34 (Notice of Service of Initial

1 Disclosure Statement); Exh. E., Response to Interrogatory No. 10.

2 9. For its Answer to Interrogatory No. 9, Swift again confirmed to Plaintiffs
 3 that, “Ms. Hodges’ September 2009 applications, while received, were not processed
 4 beyond the application stage and no consumer report was ever ordered by Swift with
 5 respect to these applications.” Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory 9; Doc. 72.

6 10. On Daniel’s December 27, 2010 online application, Exh. 1, in response to
 7 the question, “Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offense?”, Daniel responded,
 8 “No.” Exh. A at ¶ 6; Exh. B at 130:20 – 131:1; 135:20-23.

9 11. On January 24, 2011, the first day that he attended Swift’s orientation, and
 10 upon being told that orientation attendees need to be honest about their prior criminal
 11 history, Daniel voluntarily disclosed to Chad Baumgarner, a Swift employee, that he had
 12 three criminal convictions for public intoxication, battery and reckless conduct. Exh. B at
 13 139:1 – 141:15; Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory Nos. 9 and 10.

14 12. On January 27, 2011, Swift’s Investigation Department interviewed Daniel.
 15 That interview confirmed Daniel’s criminal conviction information voluntarily disclosed
 16 at orientation, and further confirmed that he did not disclose that criminal conviction
 17 information on his employment application. Swift decided not to hire Daniel because he
 18 falsified his application. Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory Nos. 9 and 10.

19 13. Daniel admitted in his deposition that, because the criminal background
 20 report was clean and because he had not disclosed his criminal convictions on his
 21 application, there was no way for Swift to know about his criminal history prior to him
 22 voluntarily disclosing it at orientation. Exh. B at 135:8 – 136:3; 147:4-7.

23 14. In the First Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs named Robert R. Bell, Jr. as the
 24 sole plaintiff for Counts III and IV. Doc. 19 at ¶¶ 36, 56 – 65.

25 15. In a call on May 11, 2012, counsel for Plaintiffs proposed dismissing Bell,
 26 the lone class representative for Counts III and IV, from the lawsuit. Swift agreed to the
 27 requested dismissal and, on May 21, Plaintiffs filed a Stipulated Notice of Dismissal
 28 Without Prejudice with the Court that Plaintiffs’ counsel drafted. Doc. 57.

16. On May 24, this Court entered the Order dismissing Bell's claims, Counts III and IV, without prejudice. Doc. 58.

17. At the Court's January 10, 2012 Rule 16 conference, Plaintiffs suggested there was "confusion" over the proper defendant and represented to the Court, "[w]e will probably be cleaning that up, hopefully, within the next 30 days and either substituting the proper party or having some notification to the Court." *See* Transcript of January 10, 2012 Proceedings, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exh. F, 23:25 – 24:5).

18. Swift Transportation Corporation is no longer the name of a company. Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC is the name of the entity that would have employed the named plaintiffs if they would have been qualified for hire and accepted job offers from Swift. *See* Exh. E, Response to Interrogatory No. 2.

DATED this 5th day of October, 2012.

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By: s/ John F. Lomax, Jr.

John F. Lomax, Jr

Brian J. Foster

Joseph A. Kroeger

One Arizona Cent

400 E. Van Buren

Phoenix, AZ 85004-220

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 5, 2012, a copy of the foregoing was served via U.S. Mail, Postage Pre-Paid on the following counsel of record.:

Anthony R. Pecora
Stumphauzer O'Toole McLaughlin
McGlamery & Loughman Company
5455 Detroit Rd.
Sheffield Village, OH 44054

Dennis M. O'Toole
Stumphauzer O'Toole McLaughlin
McGlamery & Loughman Company
5455 Detroit Rd.
Sheffield Village, OH 44054

Leonard Anthony Bennett
Susan Mary Rotkis
Consumer Litigation Associates PC
Suite 1-A
763 J. Clyde Morris Boulevard
Newport News, VA 23601

Matthew A. Dooley
Stumphauzer O'Toole McLaughlin
McGlamery & Loughman Company
5455 Detroit Rd.
Sheffield Village, OH 44054

Stanley Lubin
Lubin & Enoch PC
349 N 4th Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85003

s/ Kathy Greene

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. — LAW OFFICES
One Arizona Center, 400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6000